



Regional differences in the dynamic linkage between CO₂ emissions, sectoral output and economic growth

Md. Al Mamun^a, Kazi Sohag^b, Md. Abdul Hannan Mia^c, Gazi Salah Uddin^d, Ilhan Ozturk^e

^a La Trobe Business School, La Trobe University, Melbourne, VIC 3073, Australia

^b Institute of Climate Change (IKP), National University of Malaysia, Malaysia

^c University of Dhaka, Bangladesh

^d Department of Management and Engineering, Linköping University, Sweden

^e Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Cag University, Turkey

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 5 February 2014

Received in revised form

20 May 2014

Accepted 24 May 2014

Available online 14 June 2014

Keywords:

CO₂ emissions per capita

Environmental Kuznets Curve

Sectoral output

ABSTRACT

Environmental degradation measured by CO₂ emissions is a significant challenge to sustainable economic development. Owing to significant differences in the empirical relationship between the economic growth and CO₂ emissions and policies adopted by different countries to overcome the challenge are not decisive. This study aims to generalize our knowledge about the relationship between CO₂ emissions per capita and economic growth across the world for 1980–2009 periods. Besides, it explores whether the transformation of different economies (e.g. agrarian to industrial and industrial to sophisticated service economy) over the past few decades yielded any significant positive impact towards sustainable economic development by reducing the level of CO₂ emission. Empirical results suggest that (i) except for high-income-countries, Environmental Kuznets Curve (EKC) is a general phenomenon across the world, and (ii) the transformation of different economies towards a service economy has produced more pollution in high income countries and less pollution in low and middle income countries.

© 2014 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Contents

1. Introduction.....	1
2. Literature review.....	2
3. Data and methodology.....	3
3.1. Data.....	3
3.2. Empirical methodologies.....	3
3.2.1. Panel unit root test.....	3
3.2.2. Panel cointegration test.....	4
3.2.3. The panel dynamic approaches.....	4
4. Results and discussions.....	5
5. Conclusion and policy implications.....	9
Appendix.....	10
References.....	10

1. Introduction

Over the last two and half decades, there is an increasing threat of global warming caused by increased greenhouse gas emission. CO₂ emissions alone account for 58.8% of the greenhouse gas emission in the world (Zhenling [1]). Azomahou et al. [2] argue

E-mail addresses: mamunacademic@gmail.com (Md. Al Mamun), sohagkaziewu@gmail.com (K. Sohag), hannan@du.ac.bd (Md.A. Hannan Mia), gazi.salah.uddin@liu.se (G. Salah Uddin), ilhanozturk@cag.edu.tr (I. Ozturk).

that the existing global energy system and the economic development across the world are directly responsible for such a result.

Given this reality, a study on the regional differences in the dynamic linkage between CO₂ emissions per capita, sectoral output and economic growth is important at least for three reasons: First, various empirical studies investigating the economic growth and CO₂ emissions per capita nexus provide inconclusive, inconsistent and partial understanding of this issue. However, a comprehensive and conclusive understanding in this regard is a must as we aim at developing an efficient and effective global framework to counter the problem of greenhouse gas and focus more on sustainable development rather than the economic growth itself. Second, given the global thrive for perpetual economic growth; question has been raised if economic growth and ecological harmony is a non-existent public goods. Such question streams from the inconclusive findings of the existence of Environment Kuznets Curve (EKC) [3] in various economics around the world. Although, from the time Grossman and Krueger [4] first tested the EKC by focusing on the level of urban air pollution, till today, a significant number of studies e.g. Panayotou [5], Roberts and Grimes [6], Shafik [7], Akbostanci et al. [8], Jaunky [9], Choi et al. [10], Narayan and Popp [11], Baek et al. [12] have examined the environmental consequences of economic growth by incorporating different catalysts like trade liberalization, foreign direct investment, urbanization, size of the population, etc. Each of these empirical studies has its own dimension and has contributed to our greater understanding of the economic growth and natural ecological balance paradox. However, there is no consensus regarding the presence of EKC across various countries, and the findings are sensitive to the study period chosen, the methodology used, the country or region selected and the lack of uniformity in the selection of other intervening variables. Such results have clouded the effort to develop a global consensus on policy initiatives to augment a harmonious coexistence between economic development and environmental preservation. Third, economic growth achieved and persuaded still various countries significantly differ in their structure. Some countries historically inherit agriculture sector as a primary engine of economic growth, while others rely on industrial or service sectors. Due to the increasing importance of the knowledge economy in global GDP, a large number of countries today are shifting from traditional agriculture and industrial sectors toward a more sophisticated service sector. World Bank [13] suggest that, in post-industrialized period, there is a tremendous growth of service sector output with the agriculture sector contributing only 2%, while service sector contributing 66% of high-income countries share of GDP. Therefore, the potential for these sectors generating a different level of economic growth vis-à-vis different level of CO₂ emission cannot be ruled out. However, empirical investigations about the relative contribution of sector-wise output on CO₂ emissions per capita across regions are non-existent. This is important because, there is a possibility that different sectors might contribute differently in the overall level of CO₂ emissions per capita and knowledge about the sector contribution will help us to develop an environmentally harmonious pro-growth strategy.

Therefore, the aim of this study is to provide concrete policy recommendations by providing a specific answer to some key questions so as to deal with the problem of CO₂ emissions per capita. The questions include: (i) whether the economic growth and CO₂ emission nexus can be generalized across the world with different economic regions showing significant differences in the level of economic growth and output structure; (ii) whether a focus on sectoral output and CO₂ emission can uncover the most environmentally desirable growth sector to pursue; and (iii) whether some countries should produce less and allow others to produce more if output produced by the former countries generates relatively

more CO₂ emission and if the former countries receive appropriate financial compensation from the latter countries to enable overall reduction of CO₂ emission of the world.

The rest of paper is as follows: In Section 2 review of the recent literature is provided whereas Section 3 describes the data and outlines the methodology of the analysis. In Section 4, results and discussion are presented and finally Section 5 concludes the paper.

2. Literature review

In this study, we focused on the literature on a economic regions (e.g. Pao [14] on BRIC countries; Acaravci and Ozturk [15] on EU countries; Arouri et al. [16] on MENA countries; Moomaw and Unruh [17] and Coondoo et al. [18] on Africa, America, Asia and European countries; Hossain [19] on industrialized countries; while Friedl et al. [20] on small economies, Al-Mulali et al. [21] on Latin America and Caribbean etc. Evidently, literatures focusing on specific economic regions have imparted more generalized insight while literatures focusing on a specific country have imparted more specific insight.

Many studies also find different results using a variety of empirical models such as Ganger causality. Knapp and Mookerjee [22] using Granger causality test document found statistically significant relationship between human activities, i.e. population growth and CO₂ emissions per capita. Their findings created a new avenue for augmenting CO₂ emission and economic growth nexus in the presence of additional exogenous. Recently, using time series model, Akbostanci et al. [8] conclude that CO₂ emissions per capita and income tend to have a monotonically increasing relationship in the long run. Using the same method, Jaunky [9] confirms EKC hypothesis for 36 high-income-countries to acknowledge the finding of Akbostanci et al. [8] result. Choi et al. [10] using time-series data from 1971 to 2006, investigate the existence of EKC in the presence of trade openness for one of the most thriving economies like China, a new industrialized economy like Korea and developed economy like Japan. The estimated EKC shows different temporal patterns across countries, highlighting differences in national characteristics. The result shows N-Shaped curve for China, U-shaped curve for Japan, inverted U-shaped curve for Korea and Japan and U-shape for China. Pao et al. [23] examine a dynamic causal relationship between pollutant emissions, energy consumption and output for BRIC countries. The study documents a positive and statistically significant long-run equilibrium effect of energy consumption on emissions, while real output exhibits the inverted U-shape pattern with the threshold income and in the short term, changes in emissions are driven mostly by energy consumption. The study also documents a strong bi-directional causality between energy consumption and emissions, energy consumption and output in the long run; while strong unidirectional casualties from emissions and energy consumption to output in the short run. Hossain [19] examines the dynamic causal relationships between CO₂ emissions per capita, energy consumption, economic growth, trade openness and urbanization for newly industrialized countries. Using the time-series data, he concludes that long-run elasticity of CO₂ emissions per capita with respect to energy consumption is twice the elasticity of short run. However, the study found no evidence of long-run causal relationship between emission and economic growth, except for unidirectional short-run causality from economic growth and trade openness to energy consumption, urbanization and CO₂ emissions per capita. Narayan and Popp [11] examine the EKC hypothesis based upon the short and long-run income elasticity with respect to CO₂ emission and find that some countries should play a greater role in reducing CO₂ emissions per capita.

Using the OLS method, Lise [24] concludes that CO₂ emissions per capita and income exhibit a linear relationship rather than an EKC path for Turkey. Say and Yucel [25], however, refute such result as

spurious since, under the OLS process, the problem of stationarity exists in data set. Controlling for gross fixed capital investment and labor by employing Toda and Yamamoto (TY hereafter) [26] procedure under Granger causality in a multivariate framework, Soytaş et al. [27] came up with one of the most interesting findings for Turkey. The study finds that CO₂ emission Granger causes energy consumption while the vice-versa is not. Furthermore, lack of a long-run causal links between income and CO₂ emissions per capita signifies that a reduction in CO₂ emission does not necessarily mean a compromise with economic growth for Turkey. Using the star model with Korean data, Kim et al. [28] argue that there is interdependence between CO₂ emissions per capita and economic growth. Such interdependence shows a significant nonlinear dynamics due to the asymmetric mean-reverting property in the autoregressive process. Baek et al. [12] examine the existence of the EKC in Korea using the autoregressive distributed lag (ARDL) approach. The study finds evidence supporting the existence of EKC hypothesis for Korea for over the past four decades. Furthermore, nuclear energy (rather than electricity from fossil fuels) and energy consumption exhibit a far more beneficial effect on environmental quality both in short and in long-run.

Wang et al. [29] using panel co-integration tests for 28 Chinese provincial data find an inverted U-shaped relation between CO₂ emission with energy consumption and economic growth. The study also finds that the per-capita CO₂ emission in China is much higher relative to other emerging economies in the world. The reasons behind such findings are due to the uneven economic development, excessive use of energy, variation in the level of economic growth among the provinces. Using various panel methodologies for 12 MENA countries data, Arouri et al. [15] suggest a significant positive impact of energy consumption on CO₂ emissions per capita in the long-run, while a quadratic relationship between real GDP and CO₂ emissions per capita to confirm the EKC hypothesis. While Wang [30], also confirms negative economic growth and CO₂ emission nexus in low growth, positive nexus in the medium growth and insignificant nexus in high-growth countries. More recently, Sadorsky [31] using the emerging countries data argued that CO₂ is mostly related to the affluence of the society as well as the energy intensity of the country. Similar result has also been argued by Apergis and Payne [32] study which used nonlinear panel smooth transition VEC that was implemented for Central American countries.

In terms of the number of countries covered (i.e. 98 countries), Wang [30] produces the most comprehensive study to examine the non-linear relationship between CO₂ emissions per capita from oil and GDP in the presence of population growth. The study finds a threshold effect in the relation, and it concludes a different degree of impact of oil CO₂ emissions per capita on the different levels of economic growth. Furthermore, Ibrahim and Law [33] examine the presence of Environmental Kuznets Curve (EKC) for CO₂ emissions per capita in 69 developed and developing countries and then focused on whether the presence of social capital mitigate such effect. The study finds evidence substantiating the presence of EKC and suggests that the pollution costs of economic development tend to be lower in countries with higher social capital reservoir. Surprisingly, there is also evidence to indicate the income threshold point beyond which CO₂ emissions per capita decline is higher in countries with higher social capital.

3. Data and methodology

3.1. Data

The study uses World Development Indicators (WDI) dataset from 1980 to 2009. Due to the insufficient number of observation of dependent variable, a total of 136 countries have been selected

for the study. According to World Bank classification¹ based on per capita income these sample countries are divided into five major group: lower income countries (LIC), lower middle-income countries (LMIC), upper middle-income countries (UMIC), high-income OECD countries (HIOECD) and finally high-income non-OECD countries (HINOECD). The dependent variable in this study is CO₂ emission per capita metric tons, which include CO₂ produced during consumption of solid, liquid, gas fuels and gas flaring. Additional variables include GDP growth rate (GDPG) as the proxy for economic growth, trade openness (TO) to account for the effect of economic liberalization, agriculture value added (AVA), industry value added (IVA), and service value added (SVA) to account for the comparative effect of sectoral output on CO₂ emissions per capita. The inclusion of sectoral output is indeed one of the unique features of this study. Finally, log of the total population (ln Po) rather than urbanization is used since urbanization is a linear proportion to the size of the total population in most countries.

3.2. Empirical methodologies

The dynamic relationships among CO₂ emissions per capita, GDPG, IVA, SVA, AVA, TO, and populations have been examined by using a series of carefully designed testing procedures: First, the test of panel multicollinearity using Farrar-Glauber [34] method. The presence of multicollinearity among the regressors leading to model misspecification is a concern in the current study since the study includes a large number of variables. Assuming that x_i is normally and independently distributed, if the variables are orthogonal, there is no multicollinearity and vice-versa. Second, an examination of panel multicollinearity and panel unit roots test assuming cross sectional independence; third, the test of long run cointegrating relationship between the variables of interest using the Westerlund [35] method; and fourth, the examination of various dynamic panel methodologies are used to investigate the relationship between CO₂ and sectoral output in the presence of selected exogenous variables using Pesaran et al. [36] for different regions.

3.2.1. Panel unit root test

Since the seminal paper by Nelson and Plosser [37], the examination of unit root in macro time-series data became a convention (Al Mamun, et al. [38]). In the recent year, various panel unit root test methodologies have grown. For example, the first-generation panel unit root tests methodologies (Maddala and Wu [39], Levin et al. [40] and Im et al. [41]) based on the assumption of the cross-sectional independence across units; the second-generation unit root tests methodologies (Bai and Ng [42], Moon and Perron [43], Choi [44] and Pesaran [45]) with the assumption of cross-sectional dependence across units, and finally, panel unit root test methodologies accounts for structural breaks in the panel.

This study employs several first-generation methodologies, including Im et al. [41] one, which are based on the well-known ADF procedure of Dickey and Fuller [46]. Im et al. [41] propose one of the most efficient methodologies for investigating the presence of unit roots in panel data. The advantage of first generation panel unit root test is that it requires small time observations for the test to have power. Moreover, the use of first generation unit root methodology for identifying the order of integration of variables is not important in the panel ARDL approaches as long as the respective variables are I(0) and I(1), [47,48]; thus we apply these tests just to make sure that no series exceeds I(1) order of integration. Moreover, the PMG technique considers long-run

¹ <http://data.worldbank.org/about/country-classifications>.

homogeneity among the cross section, therefore second generation unit root may not add any significant advantages. Finally, we also employ the panel Westerlund [35] method, the result of which is not sensitive to the idea of cross-sectional independence or dependence.

Im et al. [41] method works by specifying a separate ADF regression (see Eq. (1)) for each cross-sectional unit with individual effects and no time trend.

$$\Delta y_{it} = \alpha_i + \rho_i y_{i,t-1} + \sum_{j=1}^{p_i} \beta_{ij} \Delta y_{i,t-j} + \varepsilon_{it} \quad (1)$$

where, $i = 1, \dots, N$ and $t = 1, \dots, T$.

After separate ADF regressions are estimated, the average of the t -statistics for ρ_i is calculated from the individual ADF regression using Eq. (2).

$$\bar{t}_{NT} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N t_{IT}(\rho_i \beta_i) \quad (2)$$

The t -bar is then standardized, which converges to the standard normal distribution as N and $T \rightarrow \infty$. Im et al. [41] point that the t -bar test better performs when N and T are small (though this is not the case here). The advantage of Im et al. [41] methodology is its use of separate tests for the N cross-sectional units. However, Im et al. [41] propose a slightly different version of such test when the errors in different regressions contain a common time-specific component. The study also applies Levin–Lin–Chu [40] and Breitung [49] panel unit root tests with common and individual unit root processes.

3.2.2. Panel cointegration test

Although the concept of cointegration was introduced by Ganger [50] followed by a series of works in this field led by Engle and Granger [51] and Phillips and Ouliaris [52]; however, Pedroni [53,54] was the first to study the properties of spurious regression both in homogeneous and heterogeneous panels in testing the null of no cointegration. Eventually, the test of the null hypothesis of no cointegration becomes a branch of cointegration tests. McCoskey and Kao [55] and Kao [56] develop another branch of panel cointegration tests with the null hypothesis of cointegration in their studies.

Pedroni [53,54] provides asymptotic distributions for test statistics for heterogeneous panel; those are appropriate for different types of dynamics such as endogenous regressors, fixed effects, individual specific effects, deterministic trends, etc. Pedroni [54] tests permit the heterogeneity of the autoregressive root under an alternative hypothesis consistent with the idea of Im et al. [41]. Panel cointegration tests can also be undertaken under a homogeneity assumption for the cointegrating vectors among cross sectional units (Pedroni, [53,54]; and Kao, [56]). In addition to the heterogeneous case, Pedroni [53,54] also studied properties for the especial case of homogeneous cointegrating vectors suggesting that residual-based tests for the null of no cointegration have asymptotically distributions equivalent to raw panel unit root tests when regressors are exogenous. However, panel cointegration tests with common-factor restriction cause a significant loss of power in residual-based methodologies (Banerjee et al., [57], and Kremers et al. [58]). So, Westerlund [35] develops four new panel cointegration tests against the null of no-cointegration. These tests are based on structural rather than residual dynamics; consequently they do not require common-factor restriction with optimum lag and lead lengths for each series chosen by using the Akaike Information criterion (AIC). Since the variables of interest are integrated at $I(1)$, the study applies the Westerlund's [35] cointegration test for variables under first-difference with the null

of no cointegration using Eq. (3).

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \text{CO}_{2it} = & \delta'_i d_t + \alpha_i (\text{CO}_{2it-1} - \beta'_i X_{it-1}) + \sum_{j=1}^{p_i} \alpha_{ij} \Delta \text{CO}_{2it-j} \\ & + \sum_{j=-q_i}^{p_i} \gamma_{ij} \Delta X_{it-j} + \varepsilon_{it} \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where t is time and N is cross-sectional units. α_i is the speed adjustment to equilibrium relationship in $\text{CO}_{2it-1} - \beta'_i X_{it-1}$ after a sudden shock and d_t is a deterministic component. A negative and significant α_i suggests the presence of error correction, i.e. long run cointegration. The deterministic component could take one of three possibilities, i.e. 0, 1 or (1, t) referring both a constant and a time trend for considering independence between Δx_{it} and ε_{it} . Furthermore, the bootstrap method can be used with a simple modification of Eq. (3) assuming the independence of error across time and cross-sectional units.

Thus, the null hypothesis of no cointegration is $\alpha_i = 0$ for all i , while the alternative hypothesis depends on what is being assumed about the homogeneity of α_i . The group-mean tests do not require the α'_i to be equal, which means that H_0 is tested against $H_1^g : \alpha_i < 0$ for at least one i . While the panel tests assume that α_i are equal for all i and are, therefore, designed to test H_0 versus $H_1^p : \alpha_i = \alpha < 0$ for all i . The panel statistics denoted as P_τ and P_α , test the null hypothesis of no cointegration in the panel. Again, group mean statistics, G_τ and G_α , test the null hypothesis of no cointegration against the alternative that at least one cross-sectional unit in the panel is co-integrated.

3.2.3. The panel dynamic approaches

Johansen [59], Philips and Hansen [60] argue that long-run relationships exist if variables are integrated at same order. Pesaran et al. [36] following maximum likelihood (MLE) based estimation, however, counter Johansen [59] by presenting the mean group (MG) and the pooled mean group (PMG) estimators, estimators those work with better efficiency even if variables are integrated at mixed order. Thus, the applications of MG or PMG estimates do not require cointegration tests, and analysis can be performed with unrestricted specification for the autoregressive distributed lag for time periods $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$ and groups $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$. Since the mixed integrated order amongst the variables does not affect the efficiency of the estimation, conventional stationarity check is no longer required, as well. Furthermore, this model is appropriate for the panels with large N and T dimensions.

Pesaran and Smith [48] MG methodology estimates the long-run parameters by averaging the long-run coefficients of ARDL models for each cross-sectional unit. Therefore, the test of long-run relationship between CO_2 emission and economic growth along other x_i takes the following form.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{CO}_{2it} = & \theta_0 + \gamma_{i1} \text{CO}_{2it-1} + \gamma_{i2} \text{GDP}_{it} + \gamma_{i2} \text{GDP}_{it}^2 + \gamma_{i3} \text{IVA}_{it} + \gamma_{i4} \text{AVA}_{it} \\ & + \gamma_{i5} \text{SVA}_{it} + \gamma_{i6} \text{TO}_{it} + \gamma_{i7} \ln P_{it} + \varepsilon_{it} \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where, the long run parameter θ_i for country ' i ' is $\theta_i = \beta_i / (1 - \gamma_i)$; while MG estimator for panel is $\bar{\theta}_i = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \theta_i$ and $\bar{\beta}_i = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \beta_i$. So, MG model estimates separate regressions for each country and then calculates parameters as unweighted means of the estimated coefficients for the individual countries without imposing any restriction. Therefore, all coefficients are allowed to be heterogeneous both in the long-run and the short-run. Given the country-specific heterogeneous feature in the data set, MG estimator is a rational methodology to use. Furthermore, the study fits with the requirement of MG approach, as a necessary condition for the consistency and validity of MG approach requires a sufficiently large time-series and cross-country dimension.

The PMG estimator allows short-run coefficients, including the intercepts and the adjustment speed to the long-run equilibrium

to be heterogeneous among countries. However, it restricts the long-run slope coefficients to be homogeneous across countries. This implies that $\theta_i = 0$ for all i . In order to estimate short-run and the long-run coefficients, Pesaran et al. [36] adopt the pooled maximum likelihood estimation (MLE) approach by assuming that the disturbances ε_{it} are normally distributed. The PMG is estimated according to the Eq. (5).

$$\ln \text{CO}_{2,it} = \mu_i + \sum_{j=1}^p \lambda_{ij} \ln \text{CO}_{2,it-j} + \sum_{j=0}^q \delta_{ij}^* X_{it-j} + \varepsilon_{it} \quad (5)$$

where, $i=1, 2, \dots, N$ represents cross-sectional unit, and $t=1, 2, 3, \dots, T$ represents time; j is the optimum time lag, X_{it} =independent variables like GDPG_{it} , IVA_{it} , SVA_{it} , AVA_{it} , TO_{it} , $\ln \text{Po}_{it}$ etc. and μ_i is the fixed effect. By re-parameterization, Eq. (5) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \ln \text{CO}_{2,it} = & \mu_i + \varphi_i \ln \text{CO}_{2,it-1} + \beta_i^* X_{it} + \sum_{j=1}^{p-1} \lambda_{ij}^* \Delta \ln \text{CO}_{2,it-j} \\ & + \sum_{j=0}^{q-1} \delta_{ij}^{**} \Delta X_{it-j} + \varepsilon_{it} \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where,

$$\varphi_i = -1 \left(1 - \sum_{j=1}^p \lambda_{ij} \right), \quad \beta_i = \sum_{j=0}^q \delta_{ij}^*,$$

$$\lambda_{ij}^* = - \sum_{m=j+1}^p \lambda_{im}, \quad j=1, 2, \dots, p-1, \text{ and}$$

$$\delta_{ij}^{**} = - \sum_{m=j+1}^q \delta_{im}, \quad j=1, 2, \dots, q-1.$$

and by grouping the variables in levels, the error correction equation is rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \ln \text{CO}_{2,it} = & \mu_i + \varphi_i (\ln \text{CO}_{2,it-1} - \theta_i^* X_{it}) + \sum_{j=1}^{p-1} \lambda_{ij}^* \Delta \ln \text{CO}_{2,it-j} \\ & + \sum_{j=0}^{q-1} \delta_{ij}^{**} \Delta X_{it-j} + \varepsilon_{it} \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where $\theta_i = -(\beta_i/\varphi_i)$ defines the long-run equilibrium relationship among y_{it} and x_{it} , while λ_{ij}^* and δ_{ij}^{**} are short-run coefficients relating to CO_2 to its past values and other determinants such as x_{it} . The error-correction coefficient ϕ_i measures the speed of adjustment of $\text{CO}_{2,it}$ toward its long-run equilibrium following a change in x_{it} . $\phi_i < 0$ ensures that there exists a long-run relationship. Therefore, a significant and negative value for ϕ_i is an evidence of cointegration between y_{it} and x_{it} . Finally, the average long run estimates are measured by the following:

$$\widehat{\theta}_{\text{PMG}} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{\theta}_i}{N}, \quad \widehat{\beta}_{\text{PMG}} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{\beta}_i}{N}; \quad \widehat{\lambda}_{\text{PMG}} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{\lambda}_i}{N}, \text{ and } \widehat{\gamma}_{\text{PMG}} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{\gamma}_i}{N}$$

where, $j=0, \dots, q-1$, $\widehat{\theta}_{\text{PMG}} = \tilde{\theta}$

The following four models have been developed based upon the methodology presented in Eq. (7).

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \ln \text{CO}_{2,it} = & \mu_i + \varphi_i (\ln \text{CO}_{2,it-1} - \lambda_1 \text{GDPG}_{it-1} - \lambda_2 \text{TO}_{it-1} - \lambda_3 \ln \text{Po}_{it-1}) \\ & + \sum_{j=1}^{p-1} \gamma_j^i \Delta (\ln \text{CO}_{2i})_{t-j} + \sum_{j=0}^{q-1} \delta \Delta \text{GDPG}_{it-j} + \sum_{j=0}^{q-1} \delta_{2j}^i \Delta \text{TO}_{it-j} \\ & + \sum_{j=0}^{q-1} \delta_{3j}^i \Delta \ln \text{Po}_{it-j} + \delta_{it} \end{aligned} \quad (8.1)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \ln \text{CO}_{2,it} = & \mu_i + \varphi_i (\ln \text{CO}_{2,it-1} - \lambda_1 \text{GDPG}_{it-1} - \lambda_2 \text{GDP}_{it-1}^2 \\ & - \lambda_3 \text{TO}_{it-1} - \lambda_4 \ln \text{Po}_{it-1}) \\ & + \sum_{j=1}^{p-1} \gamma_j^i \Delta (\ln \text{CO}_{2i})_{t-j} + \sum_{j=0}^{q-1} \delta_{1j}^i \Delta \text{GDPG}_{it-j} \\ & + \sum_{j=0}^{q-1} \delta_{2j}^i \Delta \text{GDPG}_{it-j}^2 + \sum_{j=0}^{q-1} \delta_{3j}^i \Delta \text{TO}_{it-j} \\ & + \sum_{j=0}^{q-1} \delta_{4j}^i \Delta \ln \text{Po}_{it-j} + \delta_{it} \end{aligned} \quad (8.2)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \ln \text{CO}_{2,it} = & \mu_i + \varphi_i (\ln \text{CO}_{2,it-1} - \lambda_1 \ln \text{IVA}_{it-1} - \lambda_2 \ln \text{AVA}_{it-1} \\ & - \lambda_3 \ln \text{SVA}_{it-1} - \lambda_4 \text{TO}_{it-1} - \lambda_5 \ln \text{Po}_{it-1}) \\ & + \sum_{j=1}^{p-1} \gamma_j^i \Delta (\ln \text{CO}_{2i})_{t-j} + \sum_{j=0}^{q-1} \delta_{1j}^i \Delta \ln \text{IVA}_{it-j} \\ & + \sum_{j=0}^{q-1} \delta_{2j}^i \Delta \ln \text{SVA}_{it-j} + \sum_{j=0}^{q-1} \delta_{3j}^i \Delta \ln \text{AVA}_{it-j} \\ & + \sum_{j=0}^{q-1} \delta_{4j}^i \Delta \text{TO}_{it-j} + \sum_{j=0}^{q-1} \delta_{5j}^i \Delta \ln \text{Po}_{it-j} + \delta_{it} \end{aligned} \quad (8.3)$$

where $i=1, \dots, 136$ cross sectional units; $t=1, \dots, 30$ time periods; λ_i are parameters to be estimated and Δ is the differential operator and \ln is the logarithmic expression. If the variables are $I(1)$ and cointegrated, then the error term is an $I(0)$ process for all i . A principal feature of cointegrated variables is their responsiveness to any deviation from long-run equilibrium. This feature implies an error correction model in which the short-run dynamics of the variables in the system are influenced by the deviation from equilibrium. The parameter φ_i is the error-correction coefficient or the speed of adjustment term. If $\varphi_i=0$, then there would be no evidence for a long-run relationship. This parameter is expected to be significantly negative under the prior assumption that the variables show a return to a long-run equilibrium.

4. Results and discussions

We begin with the investigation of multicollinearity following Farrar–Glauber [34] methodology. The result (Table 1) shows that for all variables except for GDPG in lower income countries, the F -test statistics has P -values less than 10%. This provides early evidence that there is no panel multicollinearity i.e. the problem of model misspecification does not exist.

Table 1
Farrar–Glauber [34] multicollinearity test.

	LIC		LMIC		UMIC		HINOECD		HIOECD	
	F -test	P -value	F -test	P -value	F -test	P -value	F -test	P -value	F -test	P -value
GDPG	3.055	.140	5.026	.061	4.097	.087	5.365	.055	8.765	.022
$\ln(\text{IVA})$	31.120	.002	259.165	.000	1265.473	.000	262.786	.000	692.603	.000
$\ln(\text{AVA})$	84.970	.000	89.503	.000	63.352	.000	31.405	.002	47.388	.001
$\ln(\text{SVA})$	37.812	.001	268.630	.000	1338.431	.000	259.135	.000	769.764	.000
TO	47.422	.002	261.421	.000	1263.262	.000	268.524	.000	679.465	.000
$\ln P$	25.997	.003	45.033	.001	99.239	.000	12.877	.011	12.886	.011

Then we move to test the first generation unit root test under different methodologies. Under Im et al. [41] methodology, all the variables are integrated at $I(1)$ considering both common and individual unit root process under individual intercept and no trend (Table 2). The test results also suggest that GDPG is showing integration at $I(1)$, while $GDPG^2$ is showing mixed order of integration only under Im et al. [41] methodology. Under Levin et al. [40] methodology, AVA is showing mixed order of integration and IVA is showing no integrated order at level and in first differences. TO is also showing mixed order of integration under ADF-Fisher methodology. Since there exists mixed order of integration among the variables, Pesaran et al. [36] methodology is the clearly favored estimator for the study. Moreover, the result of panel unit root test also argues for the superiority Pesaran et al. [36] over other error correction models.

Next we move to Westerlund [35] cointegration test to get an early indication about the possible cointegrating relationship in the panel data. Table 3 summarizes the result of Westerlund [35] cointegration tests. The result of the long-run cointegrating relationship between CO_2 emissions per capita and various sectoral outputs suggests that the group mean statistics does reject the null hypothesis of no-cointegration at various significance levels for every single region. So, the result provides a mixed outlook about the possible long run cointegrating relationship between CO_2 emissions per capita and sectoral output in low-income countries.

At first we determine the nature and magnitude of the long-run elasticities and the short-run dynamics between CO_2 emissions per capita and economic growth. The result has been estimated under MG, PMG and DFE alternatives following by Pesaran et al. [36]. However, the findings of Hausman [48] test confirms that in most of the cases the PMG alternative provides

more consistent, efficient and statistically significant estimators over MG and DFE estimates for all regions (Tables 4–6). Therefore, rest of the discussions is based on the findings of PMG estimates.

The existence of statistically significant long run dynamic relationship requires that the error correction coefficient be negative and statistically significant. Empirical results (Tables 4–6) clearly confirm the existence of long-run elasticities and short run dynamic between economic growth and CO_2 emissions per capita for all the regions. For example, Table 4 suggests that error correction estimates ranges from $-.501$ to $-.089$ with an average of $-.306$ for all different economic regions. Thus, it takes approximately 3.16 years to readjust the temporal shocks in the long-run equilibrium relationship between CO_2 emissions per capita and the regressors i.e. GDPG, TO and $\ln P$. However, the readjustment of the temporal shocks in the dynamic linkage is much faster (average of $-.371$) under Eq. (8.3) that includes sectoral output along with TO and $\ln P$ in the model. Furthermore, the adjustment is much quicker low income and HIOECD countries compared to HIOECD and all middle income countries.

Both Tables 4 and 5 reports that CO_2 emission is a positive function of economic growth and population size in the long-run. This finding is broadly consistent with the findings of the majority of the earlier studies (see Moomaw and Unruh [17], Apergis and Payne [32], Lean and Smyth [61], and Jaunky [9]). One would generally perceive that the rate of CO_2 emission due to GDPG or sectoral output will be much higher in case of low-income countries with miserable and unsophisticated primitive productive technology, pitiable knowledge about the negative effect of environmental degradation, low environmental regulations and standards, poor and lack of transparent environmental watchdog, etc. However, a firsthand peep on the results (Tables 4 and 5) shows an interesting pattern about such dynamic linkage. Though, GDPG exerts a statistically significant positive impact on CO_2 emission across different economic regions,

Table 2

Result from panel unit root test with level and no trend^x and individual intercept and no trend under 1st difference^{xx}.

Variables	Common unit root process		Individual unit root process					
	Levin, Lin and Chu t		Im, Pesaran and Shin W -stat		ADF-Fisher Chi-square		PP-Fisher Chi-square	
	At level ^x	1st Diff. ^{xx}	At level	1st Diff.	At level	1st Diff.	At level	1st Diff.
GDPG	5.69	–33.51***	7.73	–48.05***	.25	2341.13***	.13	333.97***
$GDPG^2$	–.64	–64.54***	–2.11*	–53.05***	26.16**	3384.97**	58.12*	1846.33**
$\ln(IVA)$	–1.05	–.09	–1.04	–19.52***	291.71	883.18***	11.54	2370.84***
$\ln(SVA)$	32.61	–3.31*	3.78	–19.15***	242.64	897.95***	296.04	2484.29***
$\ln(AVA)$	–1.58*	–3.58***	.85	–14.84***	14.32	695.18***	15.17	2251.47***
TO	–1.03	–7.97***	–1.18	–19.90***	290.65	905.08***	332.81*	2298.46***
$\ln P$	14.44	–3.69***	3.51	–11.80***	72.29	337.20***	49.16	332.34***

*** 1% refers significance at respectively.

** 5% refers significance at respectively.

* 10% refers significance at respectively.

Table 3

Results from Westerlund (2007) panel cointegration test.

Statistic	High income OECD		High income non-OECD		Upper middle income		Lower middle income		Low income countries	
	Value	Z-stat	Value	Z-stat	Value	Z-stat	Value	Z-stat	Value	Z-stat
G_τ	–2.549***	–4.016	–2.797***	–3.974	–2.238***	–3.180	–2.783***	–4.123	–2.413***	–3.737
G_α	–9.745*	–1.517	–7.984	–.104	–6.060	1.728	–7.602	–.754	–7.298	.410
P_τ	–10.931***	–3.418	–12.29***	–5.800	–12.253***	–3.155	–11.343***	–3.265	–17.020***	–7.963
P_α	–7.850**	–2.777	–12.417***	–4.859	–6.181**	–1.865	–7.261**	–2.181	–14.672**	–8.236

Note: G_τ and G_α are group mean statistics that test the null hypothesis of no cointegration against the alternative hypothesis of cointegration among some of the selected countries. P_τ and P_α are the panel statistics that test the null of no cointegration against the alternative hypothesis of cointegration among all of the selected countries. ***, **, * refers significance at 1%, 5% and 10% respectively.

Table 4The nature of regional differences on the dynamic impact of GDPG, TO, ln *P* on CO₂ emission.

CO ₂	LIC			LMIC			UMIC			HINOECD			HIOECD		
	MG	PMG	DFE	MG	PMG	DFE	MG	PMG	DFE	MG	PMG	DFE	MG	PMG	DFE
Long run															
GDPG	.005***	.001***	.002*	.010*	.009***	.030***	.002	.019***	.036***	.013	.002*	.007*	.016	.007***	.023***
TO	−.001	−.001**	.001	.002*	−.0001	.0004	.000	−.000	.001	−.003**	−.000	−.001	−.002	−.001***	−.001*
ln <i>P</i>	.037	.025***	.009	.076	−.039	.175	1.523	1.272***	.399*	.930**	.345***	.247***	.885	.080***	.353***
Short run															
ECM	−.501***	−.268***	.407***	−.465***	−.252***	−.114***	−.464***	−.181***	−.089***	−.498***	−.249***	−.196***	−.484***	−.309***	−.115***
ΔGDPG	−.001*	−.001	−.001*	−.001	−.001**	−.001	−.001**	−.001*	−.000	.000	.0009**	.001	−.001**	−.000	−.000
ΔTO	−.000	.001*	−.001	.000	.001**	.0001	−.000	−.000	−.000	.000	−.001*	−.001*	.0004*	.000	−.000
Δln <i>P</i>	−3.341	−1.646	.269	.987	−.824	−.356*	1.541	1.123	−1.066**	2.471**	−.353	.401**	.336	−.461	−.224
α	−.123	.006	−.007	−.997	.329***	−.249	−5.267**	3.283***	−.428	−3.346**	−.905***	−.446	−1.322	−.056***	−.554**
Hausman test (DFE, PMG)	2.34			18.44***			20.76***			8.28*			22.23**		

Note: LIC=Lower income countries; LMIC=Lower middle income countries; UMIC=Upper middle income countries; HINOECD=High income non-OECD countries; HIOECD=High income OECD countries

The dependent variable is CO₂ emission. *** 1% refers significance at respectively.

** 5% refers significance at respectively.

* 10% refers significance at respectively.

Table 5The nature of regional differences on the dynamic impact of GDPG, TO, ln *P* on CO₂ emission.

CO ₂	LIC			LMIC			UMIC			HINOECD			HIOECD		
	MG	PMG	DFE	MG	PMG	DFE	MG	PMG	DFE	MG	PMG	DFE	MG	PMG	DFE
Long run															
GDPG	−.000	.001***	.002**	.015*	.010***	.036***	.002	.021***	.040***	.001	.009***	.007	.008	.006***	.023***
GDPG ²	.001	−.0001*	−.000	−.000	−.0003*	−.001***	−.001	−.001***	−.000	.000	−.001***	.000	.001	−.0002	−.0003
TO	−.001	−.0004***	.000	.002*	.000	.001	.005	−.001	.002	−.003**	−.000	−.001	−.002	−.001***	−.0001*
ln <i>P</i>	.042	.026***	−.007	−.070	−.053*	.124	−.149	−1.245**	.372	1.386**	.239***	.248**	.940	.094***	.350**
Short run															
ECM	−.507***	−.268***	−.408***	−.450***	−.251***	−.114***	−.474***	−.181***	−.089***	−.481***	−.224***	−.197***	−.493***	−.315***	−.119***
ΔGDPG	−.001	−.000	−.001*	−.001	−.001	−.001*	−.001	.000	−.001	−.001	−.001	.001	.000	.001*	.000
ΔGDPG ²	−.000	−.000	.000	.000	.000	.001	−.000	−.000	.000	−.000	.001	.000	−.000	−.0004***	−.000
ΔTO	−.000	−.000	.000	.000	.0004**	.000	−.000	−.000	−.000	.000	−.001**	−.001*	.000	.000	−.000
Δln <i>P</i>	−2.889	−1.550	.240	−.015	−.832	.304	1.978	1.347	−1.062**	3.555*	.096	.398**	.317	−.491	−.221
α	−.129	.004	.011	−.759	.372***	−.159	−5.735**	3.224	−.394*	−3.562*	−.663**	−.447	−1.374	−.123***	−.564**
Hausman test (DFE, PMG)	7.26			20.73***			23.15***			48.01**			22.54***		

Note: LIC=Lower income countries; LMIC=Lower middle income countries; UMIC=Upper middle income countries; HINOECD=High income non-OECD countries; HIOECD=High income OECD countries

The dependent variable is CO₂ emission. *** 1% refers significance at respectively.

** 5% refers significance at respectively.

* 10% refers significance at respectively.

Table 6
The nature of regional differences on the dynamic impact of IVA, SVA, AGV, TO, In P on CO₂ emission.

CO ₂	LIC			LMIC			HIOECD			HIOECD			HIOECD		
	MG	DFE	PMG	MG	DFE	PMG	MG	DFE	PMG	MG	DFE	PMG	MG	DFE	PMG
Long run															
ln(IVA)	.003	.002	.004***	-.000	.015***	.009***	-.002	.037***	.009***	-.045	.019***	.016***	.013	.012***	.004***
ln(SVA)	.011	.000	-.002***	-.000	.013***	-.004***	-.030	.019***	-.000	-.056*	.021***	.012***	.013	.008***	.008***
ln(AVA)	.009	.001	.002***	-.002	.001***	.001***	-.017*	.001	.000	.017	.001	.001	.008	.001***	.001***
TO	.000	.000	.001***	.001	.000	-.0003*	-.001	.001	.000*	-.001	.000	.001	.000	-.002	-.001*
In P	.066	.008	.058***	.606	.093	-.096***	1.860*	.222	.782***	.194	-.055*	.094	.003	-.176***	.312***
Short run															
ECM	-.795***	-.439***	-.317***	-.706***	-.165***	-.293***	-.775***	-.112***	-.303***	-.632***	-.322***	-.306***	-.659***	-.272***	-.143***
Δln(IVA)	.005	.001	.001	.002	.001	.001	-.001	.001	.004	.033*	.012	.001	.000	.002*	.001
Δln(SVA)	-.010	.000	.000	.006	.001	.000	.002	.000	.000	.036*	.009	.003*	.000	.000	.000
Δln(AVA)	-.005	.001	.000	.004	.000	.002	.005*	.001	.003	.001	.006	.000	.000	.001	.000
ΔTO	-.0003*	.000	.000	-.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.001
Δln P	-4.838	.612***	-.787	7.311	.043	-.144	6.389**	-.794	.613	-.027	-1.906*	-.562***	1.798***	-.361	-.141
α	-2.288	.008	-.241***	-9.971	-.317	.482***	-17.71***	-.494	-3.259***	1.141	.016	-.430	-.890	-.910***	-.718**
Hausman test (DFE, PMG)	15.89***			27.44***			18.45***			29.25***			26.97***		

Note: LIC = Lower income countries; LMIC = Lower middle income countries; HIOECD = High income non-OECD countries; HIOECD = High income OECD countries

The dependent variable is CO₂ emission.

*** 5% refers significance at respectively.

* 10% refers significance at respectively.

interestingly; the long-run elasticity of GDPG is much higher in upper middle income and high-income countries compared to low-income countries. Why such unexpected, but immensely robust findings do we confront? Can we, therefore, argue that, compared to high-income countries, low income have achieved far more environmentally efficient economic growth over the years? Indeed, the most scientific answer to this compelling question needs a bunch of future research in this direction. However, the general economic rationalism suggests that high-income countries mostly rely on the industrial and service sectors in augmenting their economic growth. Evidently, these sectors do consume more energy either directly or indirectly, which generate higher CO₂ emission. Furthermore, energy consumption level is disproportionate between high income and low-income countries with high-income countries consuming lion share of the energy of the world.

Trade openness generally exhibits negative impact on CO₂ emission in most of the regions; however, the result is statistically significant in low income and high income OECD countries. Moreover, such impact is slightly higher in low income countries compared to high income countries. Thus, international trade has not only brought economic development to the world, but also resulted in a more environment friendly economic growth. This is because international trade requires the trading nations, especially low income countries, to abide by some very rigorous and standardized environmental practices in the manufacturing process to qualify for export to high-income countries. Finally, the impact of population on CO₂ emission is quite inconsistent across regions under different models. Initially under Eq. 8.01 population generally shows a statistically significant positive impact on CO₂ emission across regions. However, such impact is relatively higher in case of upper middle and high income non-OECD countries compared to low income and high income OECD countries. However, once we include GDPG² in the model, this parameter becomes negative and statistically significant for all middle income countries. Furthermore, incorporation of sectoral output variables in the model changes the sign for the parameters of population size in high income countries, as well.

After generalizing the result of the impact of GDPG on CO₂ emission across regions, now we answer if increasing economic growth is an endless motivation to strive. The results (Table 5) clearly suggest the existence of EKC with a coefficient of GDPG² being negative and significant while the coefficient of GDPG is positive and statistically significant across regions except for HIOECD countries. The presence of EKC could not be conclusively supported for HIOECD countries because the coefficient of GGDG though is positive and statistically significant; however, the estimated parameter of GDPG² is negative but statistically insignificant. This is a robust finding and is in contrast to many empirical findings including (Han and Lee [62]), which report a significant decline in the dependence of economic growth on pollution. This result concludes that in general a harmonious coexistence of economic growth and environmental conservation is possible for countries around the world.

Finally, we focus on the key research gap addressed in this paper i.e. understanding the regional differences on the relative contribution of different sector's outputs on CO₂ emission. The PMG result (Table 6) shows that the industrial sector output, as expected, has a statistically significant positively influences the level of CO₂ emission in all different regions. So, the general idea about the negative environmental effect of industrialization is unequivocally confirmed across regions. Besides, higher industrialization has led to relatively higher level of CO₂ emission in high-income non-OECD and upper middle income countries compared to high income OECD, lower middle income, and low income countries. Interestingly, the coefficient of industrial output is relatively much higher in case of high income non-OECD countries compared to OECD countries. This clearly indicates the differences between these regions in term of the quality of economic output produced.

Further investigation about the contribution of different sectors in CO₂ emission (Table 6) reveals some robust conclusions. The long-run impact of the service sector output on CO₂ emission across regions generally confirms that the shift from the industrial economy to service economy over the years is not a welcoming aspect of economic transformation in the high income countries. However, such transformation has led to a lower level of CO₂ emission in middle and low income countries. This is a significant finding. Service sector output exhibits a statistically significant positive coefficient of .021 and .008 for HINOECD countries and HIOECD countries respectively while statistically negative coefficient of $-.002$ and $-.004$ for low income and lower middle income countries respectively. Finally, the contribution of the agriculture output in CO₂ emission is not conclusive across all regions. However, the contribution of the agriculture output in CO₂ emission is positive and statistically significant for low income (.002), lower middle income (.001) and high income OECD (.001) countries. The result probably signifies that, in high-income OECD and lower middle income countries usually use more technologies, toxic, and insecticides in the production of agriculture output which increases CO₂ emission per unit of agriculture output. Interestingly, though the low income countries still depend heavily on primitive agriculture technologies and logistics which reduce the level of CO₂ emission; however, in recent years there is significant increase in the use of pesticides in these countries as well. A comparative analysis of the overall result reveals that service output parameters for high income countries are much higher compared to industrial and agriculture output parameters. Therefore, the increasing contribution of service output in these countries economic growth is emitting more CO₂ compared to industrial and agriculture output. This finding is consistent with the findings of World Bank [63]. Additionally, Alcántara and Padilla [64] argue that various parts of service sectors are increasingly emitting more CO₂ compared to other sectors of the economy. In fact, transportation sector, one of the major sub-sectors of the service sector, is responsible for a large degree of CO₂ emission. Due to the strong pull effect of service activities on other activities of the economy, the direct and indirect effect of service output in CO₂ emission is highly increasing.

With regard to the short run marginal effect, there is a significant variation across regions in the estimated coefficients under various models without any general pattern except in few instances (Tables 4–6). Results of PMG estimates (Table 4) suggest that the impact of GDPG is generally negative for most of the regions except for HINOECD countries. However, the results are statistically significant for middle income ($-.001$) and HINOECD (.001) countries. This indicates that GDP growth rate significantly reduces the CO₂ emission in middle income countries, while increases emission in the HINOECD countries in the long run. Table 4 also shows that TO increases the level of CO₂ emission for low income and lower middle income countries, while reduces the emission in HINOECD countries even in the short-run contracting the findings for long-run. The result possibly indicates that TO exert its immediate positive effect on output growth by opening up the avenues of international market opportunities for low income countries, and this has lead to increase in CO₂ emission the short-run. However, adoption of better technologies or stringent guidelines on environmental standard in the long-run may wind out such effect in the long-run. Moreover, size of the population does not exert any statistically significant influence on CO₂ emission in the short-run. Finally, the results of short-run impact of sectoral output (Table 6) suggest that except the short run significant impact of the industrial output on CO₂ emission in HIOECD countries, the overall short-run coefficients of sectoral outputs are statistically insignificant for all other regions. Therefore, it can be concluded that, sectoral outputs do not have any short term impact on CO₂ emission across the world.

5. Conclusion and policy implications

The aim of this paper is to examine the relationship between CO₂ emissions per capita and economic growth across the world for 1980–2009 period. The current study has highlighted several interesting findings. The following results obtained from our study: (i) In contrast to existing public perception, high-income countries are emitting more CO₂ per 1% increase in output growth. (ii) Industrial value addition increases the level of CO₂ emission across the world. While, service value addition increases more CO₂ emission compared to industrial and agriculture value addition in high income countries in the long-run. Therefore, there is a major anomaly in the way the transformation in high income countries towards service oriented economy has been worked out. However, service value addition reduces the level of CO₂ emission for low income and lower middle income countries indicating that such transformation has benefited these countries. (iii) There is a clear presence of EKC across regions except for high-income OECD countries. (iv) Economic liberalization has generally reduced the level of CO₂ emission per capita, while size of the population increased the level of CO₂ emission per capita across regions in the long-run.

The overall findings of the study offer some serious policy implications in reducing CO₂ emission per capita across the world. Since high-income countries generate more CO₂ emission per capita, the current levels of environmental conservatism efforts by these countries are clearly not sufficient. In fact, given their economic size and level of their prosperity, these countries should channel more resources and logistics to minimize CO₂ emission per capita in augmenting their output growth. The idea of putting higher green tax on output growth in these countries can be one of the appropriate mechanisms to reduce the overall CO₂ emission across the world. Furthermore, in strict environmental conservation sense, these countries should reduce their output growth if they continue to fail in reducing the level of CO₂ emission intensity since there are other countries producing similar output with less CO₂ emission.

Since service sector emits the highest level of CO₂ in high income countries, strategy to reduce CO₂ must consider a wider understanding of the service sector, an understanding that consider wholesale and retail trade, transportation, real estate, hotels and restaurants, the tourism industry and other service sub-sectors. Alcántara and Padilla [64] argue that these service sub-sectors are notably responsible for a significant increase in emissions experienced during recent years. O'Mahony et al. [65] also argue that an increase in the intensity of the transport sector contributes to a significant increase in emissions. But these services received very little attention during the design of policies aimed at reducing emissions.

Despite the presence of EKC for LIC, LMIC, UMIC, and HINOECD countries, since, the parameter of GDPG is much higher than the parameters of GDPG, an increase in GDPG will have very slow impact on the reduction of CO₂ emission per capita in the long run. Therefore, the ongoing effort to reduce CO₂ emission per capita is not going to be very effective given the level of the challenge. The recent study of Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, Chris et al. [66] has clearly highlighted the intensity of the concern. Thus we need an intense and swift global effort to augment technological breakthrough for achieving environmental friendly and economically efficient output growth in the future. Muradov and Veziroglu [67] argue that to satisfy the world's growing appetite for energy and keep our planet healthy; at least 10 TW (or terawatt) of carbon-free power has to be produced by mid-century. However, the level of technological breakthrough achieved so far to this end has not been so successful yet. So, carbon-negative system for production of synthetic fuels with sequestration of solid carbon

can be an important alternative to clean up billion tons of CO₂ from the Earth's atmosphere. Living in this age of a hydrocarbon economy, the development and implementation of new CO₂-free routes to hydrogen production from NG and other hydrocarbons with recovery of solid carbon product may present an environmentally safe alternative to CO₂ sequestration. Furthermore, any technology that can recycle the billions of tons of CO₂ into renewable energy will be an important breakthrough to this end. The global community should put serious effort in augmenting a breakthrough technology, a technology that proves the idea of growth and environmental balance a very much realizable public good.

Since the size of the population is one of the most important variables contributing to CO₂ emission across regions; therefore, population control can be considered an effective mechanism to deal with the increasing problem of CO₂ emission. However, such solution is pretty shallow considering empirical findings (Simon [68], Johnson [69], Dyson [70], Fumitaka and Qaiser [71], Minh [72]; etc.) about the positive and significant effect of population size on economic growth in countries like China, India, Indonesia, Turkey, and Brazil, etc. Therefore, increasing the knowledge base of economic agents about saving energy and negative effect of greenhouse gas, practicing more energy-efficient living can also play a crucial role in minimizing CO₂ emissions per capita. Recent studies by Mikko et al. [73], Nicola et al. [74], Bradford et al. [75], Anas et al. [76], Chris et al. [66], Dirk et al. [77], Jillian et al. [78], etc. are encouraging effort in crafting a comprehensive policy to achieve more energy efficiency leading to low carbon economies. Finally, as trade openness minimizes CO₂ emission, focus on incorporating rigorous environmental standard in the bilateral and multilateral trade and investment agreement should be duly prioritized.

Appendix

See Table A1.

Table A1

List of countries included.

High income non-OECD	High income OECD	Upper middle income	Lower middle income	Low income countries
Bahamas	Australia	Algeria	Albania	Bangladesh
Bahrain	Austria	Angola	Belize	Benin
Barbados	Belgium	Antigua and Barbuda	Bhutan	Burkina Faso
Brunei	Darus-salam	Denmark	Argentina	Bolivia
Burundi				
Cyprus	Finland	Botswana	Cameroon	Central African Rep.
Equatorial Guinea			Cape Verde	Comoros
Kuwait	France	Brazil		
	Hungary	Bulgaria	Congo, Rep.	Congo, Dem. Rep.
Malta	Ireland	Chile	Cote d'Ivoire	Ethiopia
Oman	Italy	China	Djibouti	Gambia
Saudi Arabia	Japan	Colombia	Egypt, Arab Rep.	Gambia
Singapore	Korea, Rep.	Costa Rica	El Salvador	Guinea
St. Kitts and Nevis	Luxembourg	Cuba	Fiji	Guinea–Bissau
Trinidad and Tobago	Netherlands	Dominica	Ghana	Kenya
United Arab Emirates	New Zealand	Dominican Republic	Guyana	Liberia
	Norway	Gabon	Honduras	Madagascar

Table A1 (continued)

High income non-OECD	High income OECD	Upper middle income	Lower middle income	Low income countries
	Poland	Grenada	India	Malawi
	Portugal	Iran, Islamic Rep.	Indonesia	Mauritania
	Spain	Jamaica	Kiribati	Mozambique
	Sweden	Jordan	Lao PDR	Nepal
	Switzerland	Lebanon	Mongolia	Niger
	United Kingdom	Malaysia	Morocco	Rwanda
	United States	Maldives	Nicaragua	Sierra Leone
		Mauritius	Pakistan	Tanzania
		Mexico	Papua New Guinea	Togo
		Palau	Paraguay	Uganda
		Panama	Philippines	Zimbabwe
		Peru	Senegal	
		Romania	Sri Lanka	
		Seychelles	Sudan	
		South Africa	Swaziland	
		St. Lucia	Syrian Arab Republic	
		St. Vincent and the Grenadines	Tonga	
		Suriname	Vanuatu	
		Thailand	Vietnam	
		Tunisia	Zambia	
		Turkey		
		Uruguay		
		Venezuela, RB		

References

- [1] Zhenling L. Main player in industrial carbon emissions in China. *TELKOMNIKA* 2013;11(5):2535–44.
- [2] Azomahou T, Laisney F, Van PN. Economic development and CO₂ emissions per capita: a nonparametric panel approach. *J Public Econ* 2006;90:1347–63.
- [3] Kuznets S. Economic growth and income inequality. *Am Econ Rev* 1955;45(1):1–28.
- [4] Grossman GM, Krueger AB. Economic growth and the environment. *Q J Econ* 1995;110(2):353–77.
- [5] Panayotou, T. Empirical tests and policy analysis of environmental degradation at different stages of economic development. Working Paper WP238. Technology and Employment Program, International Labour Office: Geneva; 1993.
- [6] Roberts JT, Grimes PE. Carbon intensity and economic development 1962–91: a brief exploration of the environmental Kuznets curve. *World Dev* 1997;25:191–8.
- [7] Shafik N. Economic development and environmental quality: an econometric analysis. *Oxf Econ Pap* 1994;46(5):757–73.
- [8] Akbostanci E, Turut-Asik S, Tunc G. The relationship between income and environment in Turkey: is there an environmental Kuznets curve? *Energy Policy* 2009;37:861–7.
- [9] Jaunky V-C. The CO₂ emissions per capita-income nexus: evidence from rich countries. *Energy Policy* 2011;39:1228–40.
- [10] Choi, E, Heshmati, A, Cho, Y. An empirical study of the relationship between CO₂ emissions per capita. *Economic Growth and Openness*, IZA DP No-5304; 2010.
- [11] Narayan PK, Popp S. The energy consumption-real GDP nexus revisited: empirical evidence from 93 countries. *Econ Model* 2012;29(2):303–8.
- [12] Baek J, Kim H-S. Is economic growth good or bad for the environment? Empirical evidence from Korea *Energy Econ* 2013;36:744–9.
- [13] The World Bank. The little green data book. Washington, DC: The World Bank; 2007.
- [14] Pao H-T, Tsai C-M. CO₂ emissions per capita, energy consumption and economic growth in BRIC countries. *Energy Policy* 2010;38:7850–60.
- [15] Acaravci A, Ozturk I. On the relationship between energy consumption, CO₂ emissions per capita and economic growth in Europe. *Energy* 2010;35(12):5412–20.
- [16] Arouri M-E, Youssef A, M'henni H, Rault C. Energy consumption, economic growth and CO₂ emissions per capita in Middle East and North African countries. *Energy Policy* 2012;45:342–9.
- [17] Moomaw MR, Unruh GC. Are environmental Kuznets curves misleading us? The case of CO₂ emissions per capita *Environ Dev Econ* 1997;2:451–63.
- [18] Coondoo D, Dinda S. The carbon dioxide emission and income: a temporal analysis of cross-country distributional patterns. *Ecol Econ* 2008;65:375–85.

- [19] Hossain S. Panel estimation for CO₂ emissions per capita, energy consumption, economic growth, trade openness and urbanization of newly industrialized countries. *Energy Policy* 2011;39(11):6991–9.
- [20] Friedl B, Getzner M. Determinants of CO₂ emissions per capita in a small open economy. *Ecol Econ* 2003;45:133–48.
- [21] Al-Mulali U, Lee JYM, Mohammed AH, Sheau-Ting L. Examining the link between energy consumption, carbon dioxide emission, and economic growth in Latin America and the Caribbean. *Renew Sustain Energy Rev* 2013;26:42–8.
- [22] Knapp Tom, Mookerjee Rajen. Population growth and global CO₂ emissions per capita. *Energy* 1996;24(1):31–7.
- [23] Pao H-T, Tsai C-M. CO₂ emissions per capita, energy consumption and economic growth in BRIC countries. *Energy Policy* 2010;38:7850–60.
- [24] Lise W. Decomposition of CO₂ emissions per capita over 1980–2003 in Turkey. *Energy Policy* 2006;34:1841–52.
- [25] Say NP, Yucel M. Energy consumption and CO₂ emissions per capita in Turkey: empirical analysis and future projection based on an economic growth. *Energy Policy* 2006;34:3870–6.
- [26] Toda HY, Yamamoto T. Statistical inference in vector autoregressions with possibly integrated processes. *J Econ* 1995;66:225–50.
- [27] Soytaş U, Sari R, Ewing T. Energy consumption, income and carbon emissions in the United States. *Ecol Econ* 2007;62(3/4):482–9.
- [28] Sei-wan Kim, Kihoon L, Kiseok N. The relationship between CO₂ emissions per capita and economic growth: the case of Korea with nonlinear evidence. *Energy Policy* 2010;38:5938–46.
- [29] Wang SS, Zhou DQ, Zhou P, Wang QW. CO₂ emissions per capita, energy consumption and economic growth in China: a panel data analysis. *Energy Policy* 2011;39:4870–5.
- [30] Wang Kuan-Min. Modelling the nonlinear relationship between CO₂ emissions per capita from oil and economic growth. *Econ Model* 2012;29:1537–47.
- [31] Sadorsky P. The effect of urbanization on CO₂ emissions per capita in emerging economies. *Energy Econ* 2014;41:147–53.
- [32] Apergis N, Payne JE. Renewable energy, output, CO₂ emissions per capita, and fossil fuel prices in Central America: evidence from a nonlinear panel smooth transition vector error correction model. *Energy Econ* 2014;42:226–32.
- [33] Ibrahim MH, Law SH. Social capital and CO₂ emission–output relations: a panel analysis. *Renew Sustain Energy Rev* 2014;29:528–34.
- [34] Farrar D, Glauber R. Multicollinearity in regression analysis the problem revisited. *Rev Econ Stat* 1976;49:92–107.
- [35] Westerlund J, Edgerton D. A panel bootstrap cointegration test. *Econ Lett* 2007;97:185–90.
- [36] Pesaran MH, Shin Y, Smith R. Pooled mean group estimator of dynamic heterogeneous panels. *J Am Stat Assoc* 1999;94:621–34.
- [37] Nelson C, Plosser C. Trends and random walks in macroeconomic time series. *J Monet Econ* 1982;10:139–62.
- [38] Al Mamun MD, Mia Hannan A. Fiscal policy determinants of Bangladeshi economic growth: an econometric analysis. *Int J Appl Res Bus Adm Econ* 2012;1(2):46–55.
- [39] Maddala GS, Wu S. A comparative study of unit root tests with panel data and a new simple test. *Oxf Bull Econ Stat* 1999;61:631–52.
- [40] Levin A, Lin CF, Chu CSJ. Unit root tests in panel data: asymptotic and finite-sample properties. *J Econ* 2002;108:1–24.
- [41] Im KS, Pesaran MH, Shin Y. Testing for unit roots in heterogeneous panels. *J Econ* 2003;115:53–74.
- [42] Bai J, Ng S. A panic attack on unit roots and cointegration. *Econometrica* 2004;72:1127–77.
- [43] Moon R, Perron B. Testing for unit root in panels with dynamic factors. *J Econ* 2004;122:81–126.
- [44] Choi I. Combination unit root tests for cross-sectionally correlated panels. In: Corbae D, Durlauf SN, Hansen BE, editors. *Econometrics theory and practice: frontiers of analysis and applied research*, 311. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2006. p. 333 (chapter 12).
- [45] Pesaran MH. A simple panel unit root test in the presence of cross-section dependence. *J Appl Econ* 2007;22(2):265–312.
- [46] Dickey DA, Fuller WA. Distribution of the estimators for autoregressive time series with unit root. *J Am Stat Assoc* 1979;74:427–31.
- [47] Pesaran MH, Smith R. Estimating long-run relationships from dynamic heterogeneous panels. *J Econ* 1995;68:79–113.
- [48] Pesaran MH, Shin Y, Smith R. Pooled mean group estimator of dynamic heterogeneous panels. *J Am Stat Assoc* 1999;94:621–34.
- [49] Breitung J. The local power of some unit root tests for panel data. *Advances in econometrics non-stationary panels, panel cointegration, and dynamic panels*. Amsterdam: JAY Press; 2002.
- [50] Ganger CWJ. Some properties of time series and their use in econometric model specification. *J Econ* 1981;16:121–30.
- [51] Engle R, Granger C. Cointegration and error correction: Representation, estimation, and testing. *Econometrica* 1987;55:257–76.
- [52] Phillips PCB, Ouliaris S. Asymptotic properties of residual based tests for cointegration. *Econometrica* 1990;58:165–93.
- [53] Pedroni P. Panel Cointegration: asymptotic and finite sample properties of pooled time series tests, with an application to the PPP hypothesis. *Indiana University Working Papers in Economics No. 95-013*, June; 1995.
- [54] Pedroni P. Panel cointegration: asymptotic and finite sample properties of pooled time series tests, with an application to the PPP hypothesis: new results. *Working Paper*, Indiana University, April; 1997.
- [55] McCoskey S, Kao C. Testing the stability of a production function with urbanization as a shift factor. *Oxf Bull Econ Stat* 1999;03:05–49 (special issue).
- [56] Kao C. Spurious regression and residual based tests for cointegration in panel data. *J Econ* 1999;90:1–44.
- [57] Banerjee A, Dolado J, Mestre R. Error-correction mechanism tests for cointegration in a single-equation framework. *J Time Ser Anal* 1998;19:267–83.
- [58] Kremers JJ, Ericson NR, Dolado JJ. The power of cointegration tests. *Oxf Bull Econ Stat* 1992;54:325–47.
- [59] Johansen S. A statistical analysis of cointegration for I(2) variables. *Economet Theor* 1995;11:25–59.
- [60] Phillips P, Hansen B. Statistical inference in instrumental variables regression with I(1) processes. *Rev Econ Stud* 1990;57:99–125.
- [61] Lean HH, Smyth R. CO₂ emissions per capita, electricity consumption and output in ASEAN. *Appl Energy* 2010;87:1858–64.
- [62] Han C, Lee H. Dependence of economic growth on CO₂ emission. *J Econ Dev* 2013;38(1):4757.
- [63] World Bank. *World development indicators*; 2010.
- [64] Alcántara V Padilla, Input–output E. subsystems and pollution: application to the service in Spain. *Ecol Econ* 2008;68(3):905–14.
- [65] O' Mahony Tadhg, Zhou P, Sweeney J. The driving forces of change in energy-related CO₂ emission in Ireland: a multi-sectoral decomposition from 1990 to 2007. *Energy Policy* 2012;44(5):256–67.
- [66] Chris von Borgstede Maria Andersson. Filip Johnsson. Public attitudes to climate change and carbon mitigation—implications for energy-associated behaviors. *Energy Policy* 2013;57:182–93.
- [67] Muradov NZ, Veziroglu TN. Green path from fossil-based to hydrogen economy: an overview of carbon-neutral technologies. *Int J Hydrog Energy* 2008;33:6804–39.
- [68] Simon JL. *The ultimate resource*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press; 1981.
- [69] Gale Johnson D. Population and economic development. *China Econ Rev* 1999;10(1):1–16.
- [70] Fumitaka F, Qaiser M. Can population growth contribute to economic development? New evidence from Singapore *Econ Bull* 2011;31(4):3226–39.
- [71] Dyson T. *Population and development: the demographic transition*. New York, NY: Zed Books; 2010.
- [72] Minh QD. Population and economic growth in eveloping countries. *Int J Acad Res Bus Soc Sci* 2012;2(1):6–17.
- [73] Heikkinen Mikko VJ, Nurminen Jukka K, Smura Timo, Hämmäinen Heikki. Energy efficiency of mobile handsets: measuring user attitudes and behavior. *Telemat Inform* 2012;29:387–99.
- [74] Nicola Toth, Linda Little, Janet C, Read B, Daniel Fitton, Matthew Horton. 2012. Understanding teen attitudes towards energy consumption. *J Environ Psychol* 2012;34:36–44.
- [75] Bradford Mills, Joachim Schleich. Residential energy-efficient technology adoption, energy conservation, knowledge, and attitudes: an analysis of European countries. *Energy Policy* 2012;49:616–28.
- [76] Anas Ziyadin, Antero Puhakka, Pirkkoliisa Ahponen, Tarja Cronberg, Paavo Pelkonen. School students' knowledge, perceptions, and attitudes toward renewable energy in Jordan. *Renew Energy* 2012;45:78–85.
- [77] Dirk Brounen, Nils Kok, John M. Quigley. Energy literacy, awareness, and conservation behavior of residential households. *Energy Econ* 2013;38:42–50.
- [78] Jillian C Sweeney, Johannes Kresling, Dave Webb, Geoffrey N Soutar, Tim Mazzarol. Energy saving behaviours: development of a practice-based model. *Energy Policy* 2013;61:371–81.